

THE BROOKINGS INSTITUTION

THE LIFE OF AN AUSTRALIAN PRIME MINISTER:
A CONVERSATION WITH JULIA GILLARD ON *MY STORY*

Washington, D.C.

Monday, October 27, 2014

PARTICIPANTS:

Introduction:

REBECCA WINTHROP
Senior Fellow and Director, Center for Universal Education
The Brookings Institution

THOMAS MANN
Senior Fellow, Governance Studies
The Brookings Institution

Featured Speaker:

JULIA GILLARD
Author, *My Story*
Distinguished Fellow, Center for Universal Education
The Brookings Institution

Moderator:

E.J. DIONNE
Senior Fellow, Governance Studies
The Brookings Institution

* * * * *

P R O C E E D I N G S

MS. WINTHROP: Good morning, everybody. I'm Rebecca Winthrop. I am the director of the Center for Universal Education here at The Brookings Institution. It's my great pleasure to welcome all of you to this wonderful panel that we have.

I'm just going to be making a personal introduction and very shortly turning it over to my colleagues. We have here Tom Mann, who is a senior fellow in Governance Studies with us. And then, of course, I think needs no introduction to all of you, but, of course, Julia Gillard, Australia's first prime minister. And E.J. Dionne, who's also --

MR. MANN: (Laughter) First prime minister.

MS. WINTHROP: First female prime minister.

MR. MANN: Thank you. You just don't look that old.

MS. WINTHROP: She really looks great, doesn't she? (Laughter) First female prime minister, indeed.

And then E.J. Dionne, lest the laughter covered up your intro, E.J., a senior fellow of Governance Studies.

And we are joined -- just to note lots of people in the audience, but just to note two people: welcome to Ambassador Kim Beazley, who is also the former leader of the Labor Party, and Tanya Plibersek, who is currently the deputy leader of the Labor Party and also the shadow foreign minister. So many welcome to all of you.

It's my pleasure to introduce this session, "The Life of an Australian Prime Minister," first female prime minister -- I'm now going to be haunted by that, Julia -- "A Conversation with Julia Gillard on *My Story*." And if you haven't seen her book, it's wonderful. I highly recommend it and you will get those recommendations, also, from my colleagues. And I'll hold it up, yes, indeed. And I know copies are available afterwards.

And, Julia, you'll be sticking around for a little bit, won't you? Okay, good. For anybody who wants to talk or perhaps get a book signed, et cetera.

So I'm not going to dive into the subject of the book. I'm going to leave that to the panelists. But I do want to make a personal introduction to Julia Gillard, who I first met a year ago. Can you believe it was only a year ago? She joined us as a distinguished fellow here at Brookings, working primarily on global education issues. And we were very honored to have her and I thought, well, you know, she probably will be very high-level, very conceptual. You know, former heads of state are often sort of big, big picture. And indeed, that's true, but how wrong I was in terms of how strong her intellect is.

So three points. You know, any economist who would like to go toe-to-toe with Julia Gillard on different weights of standard deviations is welcome to do so. You may lose. As a former minister of education myself and our entire team was quickly impressed at how well Julia knew education and how thoughtful she was, how technical she was. And she certainly has been an amazing asset to us in our work.

Second point, excellent strategist. We spend lots of time here at Brookings and in our work in particular briefing global leaders, sharing information on global education, showing data about trends, you know, making policy recommendations. And Julia was one of the quickest studies we ever had. I remember we threw probably it was three days of -- it was probably like two college courses condensed into three days in terms of getting up to speed on the global education agenda. Here's all the data. Here's all the trends. She took a few notes and I thought, well, I wonder if she's not interested, maybe she's bored. And then, on the third day, she had an interview with I believe Christiane Amanpour and she was on it every single fact, every data point, big picture strategy. So ever since then we've had incredible high regard. And Julia's been

very strategic and helpful in thinking through our work in terms of conducting research and analysis and impacting global policy, helping shape some of our key initiatives.

And lastly, on a very personal note, she is an incredibly warm and incredibly generous colleague to work with. Of course, at the very beginning, we said, well, you know, how should we refer to you? Is it Prime Minister Gillard? And she said please, please, please, just call me Julia. And in short order, we were talking about the pool and Australia and when we could all come visit, which I'm still -- it's on my -- you know, on the list. I'm not sure I can really deduct that as a work expense, but we're working on it.

But she's been very warm, very generous with her time, with me personally, but also with every member of my team, talking to our interns, to our research assistants, to our sort of senior executive fellows around the world. And so it's a wonderful pleasure and honor to have her in the Brookings family.

And with that, I know that I also wanted to say not only with us at Brookings it's a pleasure, but it's also a great pleasure for our global education community because not too long ago she joined as the chair of the board of the Global Partnership for Education.

I see the CEO of GPE, Alice Albright, in the audience. And I didn't get some notes from you beforehand, Alice, but I'm sure she would echo all of these things. And I know the entire global education community is very happy to have you in a leadership role in the sector.

So with that, over to you, Julia.

MS. GILLARD: Thank you very much. Thank you. (Applause)

A big thank you the Rebecca and to the colleagues here. It's great to have this opportunity to launch *My Story* here at Brookings and I do very much value

every day that I get to spend here, so thank you very much.

I, too, wanted to acknowledge Kim Beazley and Tanya Plibersek, who are here. And to acknowledge two special friends as well: Rowan, who is here, who is Ian Davidoff's partner. Ian Davidoff was my policy director for much of the time I was prime minister. And the achievements in a policy sense in this book are shared by him in a very major way.

And I'd also like to acknowledge John Tass-Parker here at the front. If you like any of the photos in the book, you probably like them because JTP took them. So thank you for being here.

And it's great to have the GPE colleagues here as well: Alice Albright and the team. Thank you for being here.

I wanted to start by just reading a few words from my book, *My Story*, and then take the conversation from there. The paragraphs I wanted to read to you are as follows.

"I first met Barack Obama at the G-20 and APEC summits in Korea and Japan, respectively, in November 2010. At the G-20 meeting he advised me not to set my expectations too high, that big summits like this could lack excitement. A wisecracked, 'What happened to the audacity of hope?'" (Laughter)

"By the time of the Lisbon NATO Summit later that year, we had established such a rapport that the banter continued. The key photograph of us shows me looking like I'm telling him off as he laughs. At an otherwise very serious occasion, it catches a quick humorous discussion about our Question Time. When I explained that I had flown out after one Question Time and would fly back into another, President Obama said he envied the opportunity Question Time gave to explain your agenda to the nation.

"'Are you mad,' I said, with accompanying dramatic overacting?"

(Laughter) Once he understood it happened every day and consisted of 20 questions, 10 from the opposition, mostly directed to me as prime minister, he was inclined to agree his statement was a bit mad.” (Laughter) So that’s diplomacy in this (inaudible). Thank you.

But on reflection, as I was writing that, I could understand what President Obama was reaching for. And I think what he was reaching for is the opportunity that, unfortunately, leaders, politicians don’t get very much, which is the opportunity to talk direct to the community, not mediated through third parties, whether that mediator is a TV news director or someone who edits a newspaper or a journalist or someone who puts a website together. We don’t actually have as many opportunities as we would like or need to have a direct conversation. And the delight in having the opportunity to write a book is you can just have that direct conversation and put it out there for people look at and to judge.

So I hope many of you do read the book. And what you will encounter in this book is, in some ways, not at all an American story, a very Australian story. And that very Australian story starts with me coming from a migrant family, migrating to Australia from Wales when I was four years old, and ended up being prime minister of our nation, a very different system than you have here. And we find that it saves a hell of a lot of time because you don’t have to have any of those debates about whether or not President Obama was born in the United States. (Laughter) You can just get to the political arguments about policy and the like, so it’s a very Australian story.

I think it’s a very Australian story in another sense, which is it would have been impossible for me, an unmarried woman, childless, an atheist to have succeeded in American politics in the way that I succeeded in Australian politics. And I think it says something about the contrast and compare between our two nations that that has been possible for me.

But you will encounter in this book debates and issues that are very familiar to people in the U.S. and ones that we face together. The book certainly canvasses at some lengths our engagement in the war in Afghanistan, our engagement in countering terrorism, which, of course, we did alongside you and so many other nations in the world. I as prime minister went to more than 20 funerals for soldiers lost in the conflict in Afghanistan. And as we now see, conflict spreading throughout the Middle East with the so-called Islamic State, I think that there are things to reflect on in the book that I learned during the course of leading our nation in that conflict.

I deal extensively in the book, too, with the shared challenge of climate change with our grand adventure in putting a price on carbon, a very fast and furious political argument, a political argument which has seen bipartisanship in our nation lost. When Labor was first elected to government in 2007, both sides of politics stood for that election on the basis that they would enact an emissions trading scheme. And if you'd stood in the center of that election campaign and said I predict that putting a price on carbon and climate change will become the flashpoint partisan issue of this decade, they would have looked at you very oddly. In a campaign where people were fighting about so much, why pick a thing people weren't fighting about? And yet, it has become the flashpoint partisan issue of our decade and, in many ways, of your decade as a result, particularly if the campaigning of the radicalized right against the science and acceptance of the science. And I canvass that within the book.

I also talk about the way in which we've worked together with you and other nations around the world to try and kick-start the global economy after the global financial crisis and some of the challenges that are still there to make sure that in our nation and in yours, though our economy has never had some of the dreadful downs and declines that you've had since the GFC, but in our nation and in yours that people can

realize the true promise of opportunity and social mobility for the future.

The book canvasses some of the big strategic shifts that are making our age, particularly what is happening in our region of the world with the explosive growth economically in Asia and the rise of China, its economic rise and consequently its strategic rise, its desire for a larger and more modern military force.

My conclusions overwhelmingly are optimistic ones and I come to those optimistic conclusions informed by my experience as prime minister. It was said whilst I was prime minister that it was impossible for our nation, for Australia, to improve its relationship with the U.S. and China at the same time, that this was a zero-sum game, that you could only improve the relationship with one at the cost of the relationship with the other. I set out to prove that that wasn't right, you could improve both.

And during my time as prime minister we took a step forward in our alliance with the U.S. We now train U.S. Marines in our northern territory. President Obama said he wanted a harsh environment for them to train in. I said, boy, have I got a harsh environment for you. (Laughter) And I do sometimes wake up in the middle of the night and think to myself that there are probably several hundred Marines who at that moment are thinking very unkindly of me. (Laughter) As they train in 110-degree heat and 90 percent humidity, I'm probably not on their list of people to be most liked. But we did take that big step forward in the alliance at the same time that we struck a new deal with China to improve our nation's access to the top decision-making tables in China, one of the few nations on Earth to be able to strike such a compact.

So it is with that experience about engaging in foreign policy with a sense of optimism and having that sense of optimism realized that I come to the big strategic shifts in our world with a sense of optimism, too.

In this book I talk about my first passion, education, which is still driving

me as I work here at Brookings and for the Global Partnership for Education; how I came to believe as a very young person that access to education is the key to transforming lives; how it transformed my own life; how my own life has been very different than the lives that my parents led simply because of access to good quality schooling.

In some ways that was a matter of choice. My parents literally migrated halfway around the world to get my sister and I a better quality education, but there was an element of luck in it, too. I grew up in the days that you went to the local government school, that it was zoned, you didn't have a choice. You couldn't canvass all over my hometown of Adelaide for the best government school to go to and we could not afford a private education. You just went to the local one. And happily for me, the local schools were great schools. But if my parents had migrated to another part of Adelaide, then the local schools would not have been good schools.

And so that element of luck has always worried my mind, you know, that you've got that *Sliding Doors* moment: Where could my life have been if my parents had moved to another part of Adelaide and the local schools had been poor schools? And why should we put any child through that kind of perverse lottery, that where they live or perhaps the financial circumstances of their parents should dictate what kind of opportunity they get in life? And it's changing that perverse lottery that drove me as prime minister and is continuing to drive me now in this international work. And I certainly talk about that extensively because my whole life story doesn't make any sense without describing that piece to you.

And finally, and I hope this book does get received on this particular point and start a million conversations; I talk about gender and leadership. I found this the hardest chapter to write. I entitled it "The Curious Question of Gender." I was conscious when I was writing it that in some ways I was in the best position to write it

because I was prime minister, the first woman, and it happened to me. I was also conscious when I was writing it that because it happened to me, in some ways I was in the worst position to write it because it's hard to be dispassionate about things that have happened in your own life.

But I've tried to unpack as analytically as I can why it is that we receive women's models of leadership differently in our very advanced societies here in the U.S. and in Australia; why it calls forth sexism and a brand of misogyny which I would have thought no longer existed in my country until I saw it played out in our newspapers, in our politics, in demonstrations on our streets where people were holding up banners saying, "Ditch the Witch" -- meaning me -- as the leader of the opposition stood in front of them; a kind of corrosive drip from the shock jocks, including one of our shock jocks, Alan Jones, who called for me to be put in a chaff bag and dropped out to sea.

Now, some of this is very serious. I managed to use some of it for comedic effect at our annual national press gallery ball where I said, "Ditch the Witch," drowning me out at sea, how can this possibly add up? Doesn't everybody know you can't drown a witch? (Laughter) So there were laughs to be had along the way, but I think that there are some serious reflections on women and leadership, how we obsess about appearance, how we judge on appearance, how we obsess about women's family status.\

You know, the issues with me, I don't have children, were how can I be in touch with family life if I don't have children of my own? I'm conscious for Tanya Plibersek, who is here; the issue has been she does have children. Well, hell, who's looking after them while she's being deputy leader of the Labor Party? These are issues where we don't let women win.

And I think there is a deeper issue, too. There is something in the back

of our brains that still whispers to us that we expect to see men acting and commanding. We expect to see women appearing and empathizing. So when you see a woman who is acting and commanding it's pretty easy to slip and say she's got to be pretty hard-boiled, doesn't she? She's got to be pretty ruthless, doesn't she? She's got to be a bit of a -- and I'll let you supply the next word. How many times have we, you know, I claim no moral virtue in this, how many times have we had these conversations ourselves about other women in our world? And as long as we allow that siren song to dictate to us images of women in leadership, then we will be holding women back.

And even as I raise these questions I'm conscious that I live in a greatly privileged place as do women in the United States. And we are not fighting, like Malala and Nigerian schoolgirls for basic rights like the basic right to go to school. We are at a different stage. But even at that different stage there are things we need to do about images and acceptance of women as leaders to take the next step in our society, even as our societies do everything we can to reach out to those women like Malala and those Nigerian schoolgirls who are still struggling for the most basic of rights.

So that's the book. I hope you enjoy it. And I'm now going to subject myself to what probably will be the hardest question I've faced on the book to date.

Thank you very much. (Applause)

MR. DIONNE: Thank you, Julia. It is great to have you here. First, I just want to say thank you to Rebecca, who really is one of the most wonderful people here at Brookings. And her center does more good -- and she and her center do more good than any six of us combined. And it was natural that she brought Julia here to Brookings, which is part of a long-term effort that Tom, Norm Ornstein, and I have to try to merge Australia into the United States. (Laughter) We like elections in New South Wales or Victoria or Western Australia as much as elections in Kansas or Wisconsin or New York.

And I also want to acknowledge my friend Kim Beazley. We met 41 years ago this fall. We were in pre-K. (Laughter) I wish. And he is one of the finest friends and one of the most principled politicians I've ever met. So, Kim, it's great to have you here. (Applause)

And Julia said that hers is a relentlessly Australian story. I am going to try relentlessly to turn it into an American story so that she can sell books in this country. (Laughter) And I think that what is most obviously relevant at this moment given the possible candidacies in the 2016 election is what you write about gender. And this is a really extraordinary chapter, and some of the same passages -- thank you to my intern, Ben Huber, who really thought these passages jumped out at him, and there's another one I want to read, but let me just read you these.

I'd like you to elaborate a little more on the gender question. You write, "Stereotypes whispered to us that a woman leader cannot be likeable because she must have given up the nurturing and feeling." You write, "If you are a woman politician it is impossible to win on the question of family. If you do not have children, you are characterized as out of touch with mainstream lives. If you do have children, then, heavens, who is looking after them?"

You write, and this is where the word that Julia avoided comes in, "Common sense would tell you that if schoolchildren filed into a classroom every day and instead of saying, 'Good morning, Ms. Smith,' to the teacher, said, 'Good morning, fat, ugly, dumb bitch,' that would impact on their levels of respect for the woman in the front of the class." (Laughter) "Somehow that common sense fled the scene while I was prime minister."

And lastly, you were with Anna Bligh in Queensland during the floods, and just to read this passage. "This day was portrayed in the media in terms like these:

'Yesterday, as the flood waters threatened her state capital, Bligh fronted the media in a utilitarian white shirt, hair looking like she had been working all night. Beside her Ms. Gillard stood perfectly coifed in a dark suit, nodding.'" What the heck was all that like? (Laughter)

MS. GILLARD: Thank you for that very extensive question. (Laughter)

On this gender bit, I've tried to unpack it and I've tried to give real-world examples because they did actually happen, about some of the silly things about women and appearance. Anna Bligh, the premier of Queensland, did a remarkable job during the floods in Queensland. And any political leader, man, woman, from any political party, standing next to her would have come off second best because she was just putting in a miraculous performance leading her state. But the fact that all of that ended up devolving down to what we were wearing I think says something about how women are judged.

And so I put that incident in there because a bit like the incident I put in there of my first overseas trip, I went and visited our troops in Afghanistan. I then went and met with the secretary general of NATO. Literally, our troops were fighting and dying in Afghanistan, and the report of that meeting in Australia, you know, read, "Julia Gillard, wearing a white jacket and black pants, is greeted by the secretary general of NATO." No need to mention that Mr. Rasmussen was wearing a suit and tie. Of course not. So, you know, in these key moments when important things are happening, you know, our nation threatened by natural disasters around the country, Queensland in particular, our troops actually engaged in a war which is causing combat fatalities, that the emphasis can be on appearance I think is limiting for women and we've just got to get through it and get over it.

But if I had one piece of advice, should there be a woman who runs for President in 2016, if I had one piece of advice it would be that dealing with any gendered

criticism or focus on appearance or focus on family and parenting, that burden actually isn't hers. I tried to pick that burden up when I was prime minister and people can judge how successfully or unsuccessfully, but that burden isn't hers. That burden's actually all of ours to engage in the debate in a way which calls for the end of gendered criticism.

And I look back on my time now, when it got particularly nutty with "Ditch the Witch" and all the rest of it, and think how powerful would it have been if in that moment a male Australian businessperson had entered the public space and even if he had said I didn't vote for Julia Gillard in 2010, I'm not going to vote for her 2013, I don't support carbon pricing, but we do not have our national conversation like this. If there had been someone prepared to do that it would have been tremendously powerful.

And so if I could give one piece of advice for any woman who ever runs for the U.S. presidency it would be to think about who are those voices actually beyond the terrain of combat of politics who can help steer national conversations back to what they should be on, which is capacities for leadership, not gender of leaders, and policy suites, good, bad, or indifferent, and keep the policy and leadership conversations there.

MR. DIONNE: Tom, could I follow up with one question? And I'd love you to come in.

I went back and looked at an interview I had with you in October of 2009, when our Tea Party was rising. And in a way, it's the flip side of the gender question because we were talking about the anger both in the U.S. and anger that had existed, for example, support for Pauline Hanson, a right wing figure, and that there was a lot of anger and it was working-class anger and it was often working-class men who have suffered a lot through globalization. And what you said is that we were confronted, I quote you, "with the politics of the ordinary guy versus these elites, the opera-watching, latte-sipping elites." And you said that the anger was driven by real problems and not

simply raw feelings.

And I'm curious if you could talk about how does one talk across that line? And it's a particular problem I think now for center-left parties, who are a kind of coalition, often unstable, between upscale more liberals in the broad sense, in our sense, and working-class voters, and that certainly that coalition is frayed some in the United States. It's also frayed in Australia.

MS. GILLARD: That coalition has frayed in Australia and I think this is an issue for center-left, for social democratic parties around the world.

In my time as prime minister we were post the GFC and whilst Australia never went into recession, that didn't mean that there wasn't a ripple of fear out there about what could have been and what, you know, might still be. Because it's very hard, you know, when this sort of wave goes around the world and you're trying to explain to people in Australia what's happening has got something to do with the subprime mortgage market in the United States. It's like what? And to then try and explain the ongoing ramifications.

And in our nation, actually in the teeth of the GFC, people weren't doing it too tough. You know, our unemployment rate didn't go up very high. The government was engaged in economic stimulus, some of it in cash transfers to families. So that didn't feel too bad.

But in the messy sort of recovery for us and the messy recovery around the world, people kept getting these economic shocks. You know, the value of their home, it probably hadn't gone down, but it certainly wasn't going up at the rate that it used to. The value of their superannuation, their retirement savings, had taken a very big knock. Many Australians are invested in shares. They've bought shares when big government instrumentalities, like our telecommunications business have been

privatized, they got big shocks from their shares all going backwards. And so very, you know, working-class people would be receiving this bad economic news. And so when you come at them with a big agenda like carbon pricing, yes, it's going to discomfort.

And I think for social democratic parties, there is still the need to fuse very important change agendas with a great deal of reassurance about people's jobs and lives. And certainly part of that formula for the Labor Party has been workplace regulation and very good social safety nets. And when we get all of that working well together, then you can offer sufficient reassurance to get people to go with you on a change agenda.

On this question of women and leadership, one of the things that I've really noticed in the more benign days since I've left politics, once you take yourself out of sort of the combat, public views towards you change very quickly. And I get a lot of very obviously working, blue-collar men come up to me now, who, in an endearingly blunt Australian way, do say, oh, I didn't vote for you. Oh, thanks, mate. Thanks for that. (Laughter) But would you mind signing this for my daughter? No problems.

And when you actually think about those two things, there was, I suspect, something about the days of my immediate leadership that made him feel a bit uncomfortable, not only the issues we were dealing with, but, you know, the next phase of the gender revolution. Now a woman's leading the country felt a bit uncomfortable. But now it's happened and it's sort of there. I think there is this sense as working men look at their daughters, you know, it would be great. You know, maybe my girl could be the next one.

And so I think if we in the progressive side of politics can harness some of that sense that really all of this discussion about gender is a discussion about opportunity for your daughters, then we can take a lot of people with us on it.

MR. DIONNE: Tom?

MR. MANN: Well, what a delight to be here with Julia and Kim and our many friends and colleagues. As E.J. said, there are these three strange students of American politics -- himself, Norm Ornstein, and myself -- that had become utterly obsessed with Australia, its people, its institutions, including compulsory attendance at the polls, which we approve of, its policies, and its politics. And Norm is here as well as E.J. We've had opportunities to travel down to Australia to visit with you there and to meet with you when you're in town.

When we recently read of and learned of the passing of Gough Whitlam, we, too, like many Australians, immediately turned to refresh ourselves and our memories about his years, decade as Labor leader. And his three-year term ended under the most extraordinary circumstances. But the beginning of the new Labor Party and Hawke and Keating and other leaders, including Kim, who led the party for a number of years, it's about time, don't you think, that we finally get our appointment as honorary citizens of Australia? We're waiting for it, I just want you all to know.

I have read this book with immense pleasure. It's a fascinating read. It's about politics and policy. It's direct, lean in its writing, and clear, frank. And Julia's quite prepared to be self-critical, to say when she thinks she made the wrong call and why. But in so many ways it's connected to American politics. And so E.J.'s idea of having a discussion/conversation with you about some of the links really fits with me.

I remember well, Julia, when your visit here in opposition. You came to a Friday lunch that Senator Ted Kennedy was speaking at, and you all had a very interesting exchange. The next time you came as minister of education and led a seminar at Brookings with a whole group of education reformers, which leads to my question.

We now -- our past, respective pasts, of education reform overlapped a good deal. Ours began in some ways with governors sort of leading up, Republican and Democratic governors. Clinton and Bush 43, to some extent even 41, were deeply involved in this national standards, testing measures, transparency, accountability. It was really fascinating to see. But now if you look at America, it's become caught up in the same ideological debates. The Common Core Standards, which were developed voluntarily by the states, are now being disowned by some of its former champions, like the current Republican governor of the state of Louisiana.

So my question to you is did you face similar opposition when you were enacting your education reforms? And will your reforms survive a change of government?

MS. GILLARD: It's a different -- in some ways a different set of issues for us and in some ways the same set of issues. Actually the tools for reform in individual schools, I think what we talk about, what you talk about, what reformers do here, what we strive to do in Australia is very much the same. But in terms of the government levers, actually the national government in Australia has more levers in its hand to force change in schools than the national government here. And I've had the opportunity to have that conversation with Secretary Duncan, for example. And I think he would pine for the kinds of levers we have as a national government.

There's a great Labor saying, a Paul Keating saying: Never get between a premier -- the governor equivalent -- and a bucket of money. (Laughter) A very dangerous place to be. And one of the ways in which we implemented our education reforms is we made money which would flow from the national government to schools contingent on adopting the agenda.

Now, around my state colleagues there were some who were

enthusiastic about that and some who were more sour-faced about it. But at the end of the day, everybody was going to take the money. So the money talked. And because in our system we flow money not only to government schools, but to nongovernment schools, we can impose -- negotiate, impose, agree, whatever word you want to use -- change agendas on nongovernment schools.

So that means, for example, when we agreed there would be a national curriculum, that's a national curriculum whether you're educated in a government school or a nongovernment school. Of the various reforms I enacted as education minister and then kept enacting as prime minister I think the transparency is here to stay. That's a website where you can see transparently the results in national testing of every school in Australia in the context of the levels of advantage or disadvantage of the kids in the school, in the context of the money supplied to the school for the teaching task.

And you can not only compare schools with the national average in testing, you can compare with similar schools. So you can do the powerful thing of saying here are two schools that are teaching quite underprivileged children. How come one is doing a lot better than the other? And then seek to identify and capture that best practice and flow it to the other school. I think that will stay.

The national curriculum has been on a bit of an adventure, where the incoming minister for education appointed some people who were immediately and, in my view, rightly viewed as quite partisan on the topic of education reform to report on the national curriculum. The fear that that generated actually didn't get realized in their final report, which is for a relatively modest set of changes and certainly not for, you know, dragging the curriculum into being an ideological kind of stick to beat children over the head with.

The main piece which is in contest is the funding reforms, where we

reformed school funding, so funding now flows to match need. We know that children from the most disadvantaged homes can get a great education, but it costs more to achieve that for them. And so we have a system, created a system, so they get more for educating those children. That's locked in sort of overwhelmingly by intergovernmental agreements. The current prime minister said he would keep the whole lot. He has resolved from netting government and now particularly the final two years of this six-year change are at risk. And whilst Tanya is in a far better position than me to talk about Labor's policy suite for the 2016 election, I would anticipate that school funding reform will be one of the big issues; completing and keeping that funding reform will be one of the big issues in 2016.

And I certainly think it's a great debate to be in because it's quintessentially about whether or not the nation is prepared to make available for the education of every child the amount of resources necessary to get that child a good education.

MR. MANN: E.J. had a follow-up and so I was going to do it, too.

MR. DIONNE: Go ahead.

MR. MANN: Which really goes to minority government. I remember being at Kim's residence the morning, late morning, afternoon, of Election Day 2010, and it took us what it took you to -- 17 days as I recall, to put together a minority government. I'm still fascinated about how you did that and the book helped because you really wrote about some of the details, but I hope you'd share that with, and it was especially difficult because of developments and politics within your own party.

But tell us how a minority government differs from U.S. divided party government and how you can get things done in a minority government that we can't possibly do these days in divided party government.

MR. DIONNE: And did any of the people who supported you get money in Swiss bank accounts? (Laughter) Discover in about 20 years. (Laughter)

MS. GILLARD: Absolutely no Swiss bank accounts, I can guarantee you that. And interestingly, no one asked for a Swiss bank account, so that's a good thing, too.

I mean, our system is, you know, the Westminster system, so whether or not you govern depends entirely on whether you have a majority in the House of Representatives. And our system is one of very rigorous block voting by political parties. So whilst here you will have lots of debates about whether -- on, for example, Waxman-Markey climate change, whether a Democrat would vote for it, whether a Republican would vote for it, whilst you will have those kinds of debates, in Australia a Labor proposition, everybody in the Labor Party will vote for it. And whilst our conservative parties maintain a fiction of freedom to cross the aisle when you want to, in reality they block vote all the time, too.

The only limited examples of people just individually voting are on some conscience questions that are defined as conscience questions: things like abortion and same-sex marriage, where you'll get people making individual decisions. And you'll get mosaics of political party members sitting for one proposition or another.

So, I mean, my task in the 17 days, given we didn't have enough Labor members to form a government, was to add enough independents to our pile to get the votes. I needed to get four. In the first instance, we negotiated with the Greens political party which sits to our left and is highly focused on protest politics and environmental politics. That required me to be satisfied that they could be welded in a way that would, you know, keep them on the straight and narrow for the period of our government.

They wanted to, you know, enjoy executive power and I was never going

to do that. But we were able to negotiate some policy issues, and carbon pricing was one, where we could work through and step through.

And then I needed to secure other votes and the most likely were two country independents, Tony Windsor and Rob Oakeshott, and a man from Tasmania. Now, our history is written now as if it's inevitable I was going to win through and form this government. But actually, going into those 17 days, the independent from Tasmania, Andrew Wilkie, I had never met in my whole life. The only thing I knew about him is he had become politically active as a person in our intelligence community, who had objected to the way in which the Howard government had used intelligence to justify us engaging in the Iraq War. So kind of a familiar story, a story here and a story in the UK.

And then the two country independents, whilst they became very good friends, over the three years they actually came to the launch of my book in Australia, which was very generous of them. In the start of those 17 days I didn't know them well. I dealt with them once over a student income support issues, when I had a change agenda as deputy prime minister and that was really it.

And so, I mean, you know, with all of the weight of can you form a government, in the moment it was really extensive studying of these people in person. What can I get to know about them? All of the things they'd ever said publicly, that they'd ever said in the Parliament, their voting records. What could I get to know about how they saw the world and could I find some connection points between us and them which would make it viable? And over 17 long days, and they certainly were long days, I managed to do that.

And it was, and I describe this in the book, for me, in some ways, it was kind of a lonely time. Whilst Wayne Swan was sort of there supporting me and I had great staff supporting me, including Ian Davidoff, you know, either I could do it or I

couldn't. There wasn't actually a whole lot that even the best of my ministerial colleagues could do because it needed to be this leadership style negotiation.

And so I recount in the book ringing one of my good colleagues, Penny Wong, who went on to be minister for finance, about something I wanted to check with her. And it was like 10:30 in the morning and I said what are you doing? And she said I'm roasting spices. I said you're roasting spices? And so for a minister with a lot of energy in this 17 days of kind of stasis, she was taking her energy out by making the world's most complex meals from scratch, right, to the extent of roasting the spices. (Laughter) I don't even know how you do that, but, apparently, it can be done.

And, I mean, Tanya would remember what it was like, too, but it was this sense of, you know, waiting, waiting, waiting and working, working, working, and then finally we got enough people to say yes. But once everybody said yes, there was actually this great growing sense of common endeavor, which meant that people hung together even in very difficult days and for some very controversial propositions.

And we then had the reverse of the problem for most Australian governments. Most Australian governments, including the current government, have the numbers in the House of Representatives, so they can bang something through. They get to the Senate and they don't have the numbers and they've got to flounder around and negotiate. Or government's budget is very hostage to that process at the moment. We had the reverse. Once we could get the numbers in the House of Representatives, basically we could get it through the Senate because it meant the Greens were on board. They'd vote with us in the Senate and we'd get it through.

And so it turned out with all of this odd start and curious dynamic as a minority government to be a very productive Parliament in terms of the pieces of legislation that went through. And there are days when I get a bit of a wry smile and think

to myself we got budget bills through in record time. If I'd ever taken the amount of time the current government is taking to get its budget through, our newspapers would have been screaming "Crisis" in huge fonts on the front. Our prime minister has been fond of talking about budget emergencies. Actually, you know, an inability to get your budget legislation through is a bit of a problem. And it'll be interesting to see when the focus goes back on that problem and what can be achieved through negotiations by this government.

MR. DIONNE: I just want to say that, you know, the Labor Party is full of literate people. Not only did Julia write a book, but Wayne Swan, the treasurer and deputy prime minister, wrote a very good book. And now I'm thinking Penny Wong has to write a book called *Roasting Spices: A Sharp and Tangy View of Politics*. (Laughter)

I want to open it up to the audience because we've got so many people here who know a lot about Australia, so I'm going to combine two questions. The book is brilliantly organized for political junkies. I told Julia this is a good way to sell the book. All the great politics is in the first 130 pages, so political junkie journalists can read the first 130 pages and leave substance like education, climate change, economic collapse to somebody else. (Laughter)

But there is at the beginning a chapter called "The Enemy Within." And while my first quotation is going to be your view of the press, that is not the enemy within, but it's about what was happening inside the Labor Party. So I'll ask two questions.

One is just the media in general. And the setup in Australia is somewhat different than ours, although there are some things in common, I think. But you have a wonderful line where you said, "Good government does not work at the same speed as the media. No journalist is ever going to be happy with a day in which the prime minister quietly and methodically reads at meetings, thinks deeply, and makes decisions." I'd just

love you to talk about that.

But for those of us here watching your Labor Party, and especially for those of us who have a general sympathy for the center-left, it was really a what are you people doing over there sense. I mean, first, you throw Kim out as leader and you express some regrets about that in the book. You and Kevin throw him out as leader. Then you throw Kevin out as leader and then Kevin throws you out as leader. And then there is an election, finally, where the voters, even though Labor had the best economic record, arguably, of any government of a democratic country in the world, you lose the election.

So if you can talk about, A, the media and, B, what is it with your party?

(Laughter)

MR. MANN: Those are the easy ones.

MS. GILLARD: Right, two very simple questions. Thanks for that, E.J.

MR. DIONNE: And then we'll have a softball from the audience.

(Laughter)

MS. GILLARD: On the media I actually think there's a set of common problems here. But, if anything, we've got an extra problem, and the extra problem is because we are a limited population -- only 23 million people -- whilst this age enables the development or alternate media, our market is pretty thin. So it's only going to sponsor so much alternate media. Whereas here, because the market is thicker, deeper, more people, more people interested, more money, therefore, in potential circulation to media outlets that you'll end up and you are ending up with more diversity than us.

But the thing that's common is in this media age I've been comparing it in speeches to the advent of all-you-eat restaurants. Do remember when we first got all-you-can-eat restaurants and you'd go into a buffet table groaning with food, and you'd go

a bit mad, wouldn't you? I mean, I don't know what it was, but you would go a bit mad and you'd just be stuffing down as much food as you humanly could from the time you were in the all-you-can-eat restaurant. And I think we are at that stage with our media, that it's so much coming at us so quickly that the journalists who are generating it, many of the best journalists who are generating it are regretful that they can't spend more time on generating deeper pieces, but they've got editors barking at them to fill the space. You know, blog, Tweet, get on 24-hour TV; get your column in, blog, Tweet again. That it's thinning out our national conversations.

And everything emerges devoid of context. It's like it pops out, no looking back, what does this relate to? No looking forward, what could this possibility lead to? And no depths. And so --

MR. DIONNE: Otherwise it's perfect.

MS. GILLARD: Otherwise it's perfect. So I talk in the book about the experience of launching major policies mid-morning, which required through and analysis, and having journalists by midday ringing my press office, saying have you got a story for us? Because, you know, they've Tweeted, they blogged, they appeared on 24/7 TV, where journalists now take to interviewing journalists. They don't actually need talent anymore, that's superfluous. They've got each other. And then the cycle moves.

So I hope that this is a transition time. And because the technology enables us to get all of this information, we'll get used to it and we'll move to a newer age where we go from the all-you-can-eat back to the more selective I'd rather eat less, have it of better quality, and have it more customized to my tastes. And in the media parallel, I don't mean by that biased, I mean by that a deeper dive into the issues I care about.

But we aren't there in Australia and you aren't here in the U.S. And it's been interesting for us having watched President Obama's mastery of social media and

new media when campaigning that when governing he's had the same problems with the speed and thinness of the media that we've had.

On what's wrong with our political party, I feel like I should be deferring to Kim and Tanya on this. I think, look, if you were trying to draw across all of the events and they were different elements in each of them and different personalities in each of them -- and I speak about Kim and my sense of regret about events involving him in the book, but if you wanted to draw across all of it -- I think our political party is, in the modern age, still trying to get the balance between how much it is a leader's party, how much of its identity is defined by the leader, and how much of its quest for popularity is correlated with the leader's acceptability to the electorate as measured by polls versus how much it is a party with a leader and a sense of purpose that brings together the many elements that go to make up the Labor Party.

And I think over a long period of time and to the cost of some very good leaders, we've erred on the side of being a leader's party looking for that quest for popularity rather than looking for purpose and genuine leadership ability. And that has been what has chartered so much of our political fortunes over the last few years.

MR. DIONNE: The book has in loving and I suppose unloving detail the fight, and it's a fascinating account of this period. Tom, would you hold -- I want you to come back in, but I'd like to see who --

MR. MANN: Absolutely.

MR. DIONNE: Do we have mics going around? Stanley, over on the right, not necessarily -- that's not a political description. It's my right, your left, and so that leaves you in the center.

MR. ROTH: Stanley Roth, Boeing. It's good to see you again. Welcome to Washington. I want to bring the conversation back to foreign policy.

And one of the things that happened on your watch was the U.S. pivot or rebalance towards the Asia-Pacific region. And not trying to draw you into the semantics of what word would have been best, but just a very straightforward question: How do you think we're doing with the policy looking at it now and all the things that have happened?

MS. GILLARD: Okay. Yes, the pivot/rebalance did happen on my watch and I do need to pay a tribute to former Prime Minister Rudd here. He certainly put to the U.S. clearly the need for the U.S. to join the East Asia Summit, and it was advice that was agreed to and it was very good advice. And, you know, the joining of the East Asia Summit was an element of what became the pivot.

I mean, the pivot was given a lot of image and flesh when President Obama came to Australia, spoke to our Parliament, talked about the U.S.'s deep engagement in the region. And, at the same time, Secretary Clinton was standing on an aircraft carrier just out of the Philippines, and so the whole imagery was an American President is here in the region speaking about the U.S. and its future in the region. And yes, the U.S. is a formidable nation and he is the image of being formidable. You know, aircraft carriers, well, Kim would know about them than I ever will, but they're bloody big things that do a whole lot of stuff. (Laughter)

So that, I think, if you -- I mean, not obviously us, Australia, with our longstanding alliance with the U.S., but if you were a nation in the region that was calibrating its future, U.S., China, where do I stand? How do I navigate this? That was an important moment.

What was, unfortunately, also an important moment was when President Obama couldn't come to APEC and the East Asia Summit last year because he was tied down in Washington with the debt default problem. And if you were one of those nations thinking U.S.-China, U.S.-China, where are we going to be in 5, 10, 15 years' time, I think

the problem with that is people don't doubt the word of the U.S., that it seeks to be deeply engaged in the region. But when they look at Washington, they get question marks in their mind about the capability to see it through. And that's actually not a good place to be.

And so reputation-wise I think there is a need to very deeply read -- it's not like you've gone, but it's the visibility of the engagement needs to be lifted in the years to come.

MR. DIONNE: Note we're making progress, by the way. The former prime minister did not tell us what Hillary Clinton was wearing on the aircraft carrier.

(Laughter)

Who has -- over here. Let's take a few, let's take these, if I could, three women right here in the back with the black hair, over here, and then right here. Right behind you. Yeah, put your -- and then just pass it up to your colleague. Why don't we take three at once so we can get more voices in?

BIANCA: My name's Bianca. I'm from Perth in Western Australia. I'd like to say hello to Kim Beazley firstly. I'm happy (inaudible). Hello.

MR. DIONNE: Kim is from there.

BIANCA: And thank you for speaking, Prime Minister. I just have two questions. The first is on gender and I'd just like to know basically how you mentally dealt with the misogyny and the chauvinism that you dealt with on a daily basis, both from those on the opposite side of the bench and from those in the media.

And secondly, I have a question on education, which is based on the current sort of problems with the current government's looking to not cap the university, what is it, charges so that universities can set their own prices on degrees, what's your opinion on that? Because as someone who's just finished university two years ago, that

scares the hell out of me thinking that the social gap in Australia could widen because there's students who don't have access to that. I was lucky and fortunate that I could, but it's just going to get worse, in my opinion. What's your view on that?

MR. DIONNE: Thank you. Excellent. And for that matter, the misogyny inside your own party, if I can ask that, if you saw it, too. Please.

MS. NEARY: Ms. Gillard, my name's Adele Neary. I'm a fellow Adelaidean. I just wanted to let you know. I'm currently based at CSIS, but usually an Australian government employee with DFAT.

I just wanted you to know, as well, that in my household at least it has happened more than once that I've come home after experiencing some everyday sexism and looked on YouTube and watched your misogyny speech for some inspiration and a reminder that my daily troubles are probably not as bad as yours were. (Laughter) My question is also on the sexism issue.

You obviously experienced the most appalling and vulgar sexism while you were in the nation's highest office. Obviously before you were in politics you had a different career. And I just wondered if you had any comments on how sexism manifested in the law firm that you worked in, in a sort of more regular workplace. And were you surprised by the changes that you observed when you became prime minister? Thanks.

MR. DIONNE: Thank you so much. And there was a hand here. Yeah, please. And then we'll go one more round I think and then I'll let Tom ask a last question.

SPEAKER: Good morning, Ms. Gillard. Thank you so much for being here. My question actually builds off of the two that were just asked. But first of all, I'd like to take this opportunity to personally thank you so much for the grace and the humility that you displayed as prime minister. As a young professional looking to enter

the field of foreign policy and international affairs, I certainly looked to you as a role model being a young female professional looking to enter what's typically been a male-dominated field.

So as a young professional, I'm just curious to know were the challenges that you experienced early on in your career. And how you overcame those challenges.

MS. GILLARD: Okay, thanks. They're all very good questions. I'll try and do my best to answer them.

On the sort of sexism in different contexts -- in politics, law firm, my early days in the Labor Party -- I think a difference really is the degree of division you encounter as prime minister in politics and how white-hot the spotlight is. You know, in the law firm where I worked, Slater and Gordon, it could be a pretty boisy, rowdy kind of place. In fact, that was part of its imagery. You know, it was unashamedly a labor law firm and it had sort of a boisy kind of out there image. But because the divisions or debates within the partnership in the firm generally weren't, you know, very hot, you know, people might have slightly different views about things, but over the time I was in the partnership, most partnership meetings there was a great degree of consensus across the firm. There was a great degree of consensus about what we were trying to do. You didn't quite see it the way that I saw it as prime minister, and then you didn't have this public spotlight on it either.

And I think the difference really is when I became prime minister I deliberately thought I won't try and shine a spotlight myself on being the first woman. It's just so obvious that I am. I don't need to wander around, oh; did you know I was the first woman? (Laughter) And I thought that any positive reaction to that, any negative reaction to that would be at its greatest immediately after becoming prime minister and it would abate and then I'd just be judged on being prime minister, how good or bad was I

doing the job.

What I actually experienced and what is I think different from the law firm and different from my early days in the Labor Party is that when it got hard and, you know, divided, sexism became the convenient instrument of criticism. So instead of saying she did that badly or she's wrong about this, it was framed as a sort of sexist attack. And that element of politics, I think, is the one that people sort of latched on to for good or ill. And it's that element of politics I've tried to deal with in the book.

In terms of dealing with it, which was your question, I talk about this in the book and I actually hope -- you know, I'm no kind of lifestyle guru. I haven't tried to write an *Eat, Pray, Love* self-help kind of book. (Laughter) I wouldn't be any good at that. But I have tried to talk about resilience and what you can do to work resilience up. And I genuinely think resilience is a muscle. It gets stronger if you use it.

And I've tried to talk about strategies that worked for me because actually, in the modern age, you don't need to be in politics to feel that you are besieged by a lot of criticism. I actually can't imagine what it's like to grow up as a teenage girl today with all of the normal teenage anxieties about are you too chubby or you're not pretty enough or you're not popular enough, you know, all of the things that kids go through, and have an instant chorus of criticism on social media. I can't imagine what that's like but that's today's reality. And whether you're prime minister and that chorus of criticism is the newspapers and the TVs or whether you're that teenage girl and the chorus of criticism appears to be the whole world, but it's actually the 30 or 40 people you know, which kind of is your whole world, I think a strategy for dealing with it that I talk about in the book is really trying to sort of nurture a sense of self that isn't pushed around by the critiques of others.

And having watched other women in politics, I think one of the things that

you can easily succumb to is theirs, for a period of time, when there's a new woman on the scene, there's this sort of golden girl phenomenon. Isn't she doing well? Isn't she good? And you get put on a pedestal. Then it's a long way to bloody fall. You know, pedestals are high. And when you fall, you go through the other end of the cycle. I deliberately made a set of decisions that I was not going to let my sense of self be hostage to either the golden girl phenomenon or the crash off the pedestal, that I was the same person on the days the newspapers were running well for me and the days the newspapers were running badly. And I think that's an important kind of coping strategy.

On getting ready for politics, the sort of, you know, what forms you, in a wonderful Labor Party style I got some early lessons in resilience because it took me until my sort of mid-twenties to decide that I would like to be in politics. And then it took me 10 years and three failed pre-selection attempts to get there. I wasn't thanking the Labor Party for this treatment at the time, but looking back on it, across the full sweep of politics, I think it probably did help toughen me up a bit and enable me to get some sense about how you deal with rejection and how you deal with when it's hard. So I'm not suggesting you go and throw yourself into as many negatives experiences as possible, but in the way of things life has a habit of handing out a few to most people and it's important to learn from them and strengthen the resilience around the comeback.

MR. DIONNE: Thank you so much. Yeah, the next book is *Eat, Pray, Vote*, I think. (Laughter) That was lovely.

Could we -- maybe one more quick round. Who's got -- the hand way in the back there and then the lady over there and then the lady in front of her. I'm sorry; I think we're supposed to close down soon. Is that correct?

MR. MANN: You have three minutes to go, right.

MR. DIONNE: So I'll do one round. Tom will ask one, I'll ask one, and

then you can skip any of them that you want. Go ahead, sir.

MR. KEHOE: Hi, Ms. Gillard. It's John Kehoe here from the *Australian Financial Review*. Thanks for your presentation this morning.

You lamented in some of your earlier comments about the bipartisanship being lost in the Australian Parliament on issues such as carbon pricing. Australia's new Prime Minister, Tony Abbott, has just called for a mature debate on things like tax reform and signaled that maybe there should be a mature debate about increasing the GST. Do you think that's something that both sides of Parliament could engage on maturely, including the Labor Party?

MR. DIONNE: Hang on. Mature debate is something we could all use. Thank you so much for that.

Back here and then the lady in front of you. And I'm sorry to everyone else, but Julia will be signing books, so you can ask her your question there. Please.

MS. BINDÉ: Hi, my name is Fadivia Bindé. I am at CSIS. And I have a question about -- well, first, thank you for all you said and all you did, but I have a question on the press.

It has always fascinated me how the press loves or hates people and report well or bad regardless of their work. And you're clearly a case where the press, they love you. You know, they did their best to impose on you. And my question is looking back, would you change something, your relation with the press? Is there anything you feel you could have done to come out better there or it was just hopeless? And in that case, why? Thank you.

MR. DIONNE: Thank you. And diplomatically, you did not mention the name Murdoch, so I'm mentioning it. (Laughter) And you can sort of talk about that, if you'd like.

Please.

MS. YOUNG: My name's Lee Young. Thanks for your presentation. But since you're through all kinds of issues I just wonder as the prime minister, that kind of position is a very, very strong position that you should have in order to deal with the public interest, you know, the interest for the general public. So currently, (inaudible) really don't agree with capitalism and they don't agree and the United States don't agree with communism. So I just wonder if you can come up with something that can really improve the general public interest, you know, and get rid of those 1 percent versus 99 percent problems?

MR. DIONNE: Thank you. Go ahead. Oh, and then, Tom, why don't you --

MR. MANN: Well, let's let Julia --

MR. DIONNE: Why don't we pile ours on so we can end?

MR. MANN: Okay. Just a brief question. You came out of the left faction of your state, but it was one of the two left factions. Yet I look at your politics as they've developed and seen people out of the right of the Labor Party moving to the left of you. Do those factions within the Labor Party still have any ideological meaning? And are their days numbered or will they be with us, but primarily for other purposes?

MR. DIONNE: I love that question. That's a total Australian political junkie's question.

MS. GILLARD: It is. It is.

MR. DIONNE: And then my quick question is something I mentioned last night when we were talking. You know, we think a lot about Mrs. Thatcher as obviously a major figure, a woman who served for a long time. Do you think there's a difference between being a woman of the center-left or of left and a woman of the center-right? And

is it harder if you're on the center-left?

MS. GILLARD: Okay. All right. I'll do my best.

MR. MANN: No notes. (Laughter)

MS. GILLARD: How could you possibly prepare for this? (Laughter)

I mean, I think, just picking up your questions and actually going to the question that was about the media, one of the features of the Australian media landscape is we have one of the most concentrated media markets in the world. I come from the city in Australia, Adelaide, that gave Rupert Murdoch to the world. He's from Adelaide. And when I was growing up in Adelaide it was impossible to buy a newspaper that wasn't owned by Mr. Murdoch. The morning paper, the afternoon paper, and the local papers were all owned by Mr. Murdoch.

All of these years later, in many parts of Australia, the readily available -- with all due apologies to our friend from the *Fin Review* -- the readily available newspaper for people is only a Murdoch paper. So the daily paper is only a Murdoch paper. So that does mean that there are questions of quality and questions of bias that intersect with our politics. And I deal with some of that in the book and my hankering for a media market that had more diversity and more quality in its presentation to the public, and certainly on carbon pricing to take just one big debate. Some of the things that got published as facts were just so ridiculously rubbish that, you know, it distorted the public discussion in a way that's not helpful.

And it does always bemuse me that you get editorials in newspapers beating up generations of politicians saying why aren't they more visionary? Why aren't they more prepared to tackle deeper debates? Whilst the news pages are making sure that any deep debate gets distorted and pulled apart, often by quite spurious reporting.

I think it actually then links back to this question of gender and a center-

left woman versus a center-right woman. You know, the issues of gender for me were playing out in a media market which was overwhelmingly hostile to the government's agenda query: If you were from the center-right and were pursuing an agenda that got a lot of support in our media market how would questions of gender play out? Well, I think that they would still be there a bit, but you wouldn't have the media who was against your agenda then using and reflecting some of this gendered criticism because they wouldn't be in the criticism business. So I think there is a connection here.

On the day-to-day political question from Australia, I'm going to disappoint you and say you need to talk to a day-to-day Australian politician like Tanya about that because they're debates for her and the current generation. And one thing I try to be as rigorous about as possible is not peeking over looming over the shoulder of the current generation, but they've got my complete support and I hope they do well in the tax debate that you were talking about, as well as all others. And I'm confident that they will.

On, you know, the issues about the factions in Labor, for a long period of time, I mean, well before I was prime minister, well before I wrote a book, well before I was deputy prime minister, well before I was even deputy opposition leader --

SPEAKER: Before you were born.

MS. GILLARD: Well before I was born. (Laughter) Well, not as far back as that, but a long time back in my political career I decided in the modern age most of this was nonsense. And I get where it came from, a difference of opinion around attitudes towards communism and the Soviet Union and defense alliance and U.S. and the whole nine yards. But in the modern age, without those fault lines, it really had sort of ceased to have meaning. And I think the real fault lines in Labor today, you know, there is a broad consensus on the economic sphere, the power of markets, the engagement

with markets, the need for markets to be properly regulated, the need for good social services, the need for us to have a strong and productive economy, make our way in the world. The free trade agenda, there's a broad consensus on that, which takes in lots of what people would call the left and lots of what people would call the right. You've got a few kind of outliers on either side on that economic consensus, but it's quite broad and quite deep.

And then there's the social policy continuum that runs from the more progressive end through to the more conservative end on questions like abortion, same-sex marriage, maybe with some reflection back into women's roles. And, you know, most of those things, the pressure gets taken off by conscience votes.

So I got elected into Parliament at the same time as a very good friend of mine, Nicola Roxon, who was a wonderful health minister. Tanya took over her health portfolio when Nicola went to be our first female attorney general. Amongst other things, she pioneered plain packaging of cigarettes to try and dissuade young people from smoking, and that appears to have had some effect. But, you know, we got elected at the same time. We were always great mates. She was in the right, I was in the left, and there would be precious few issues that, talking amongst ourselves, we ever disagreed on. So it just kind of goes to show a lot of this doesn't really make sense.

Will it endure? I think it probably will for a period of time to come. It's like a habit you can't quite give up and it does, at its best, the fact that there are organizing units within the party does help manage potential conflicts and debates. So at its best, it's got a role.

But I think we're on a journey for democratizing the Labor Party, the first step of which was taken with the direct balloting for leader after the 2013 election with the election of Bill Shorten as Labor leader. And I think the more steps we take towards

democratization, the less and less the influence of the traditional factions will be because they won't be able to guide a bigger and bigger pool of people, and I think that that's a very healthy development.

So I hope that's done as much as I could on those kinds of questions.

MR. DIONNE: I am sure now Mr. Murdoch says I come from the city that gave Julia Gillard to the world. (Laughter)

I want to say, in closing, first, we are honored and happy to have Julia as a colleague here at Brookings. Second, she will be signing books. And third, I just want to read a passage that actually goes back to Penny Wong and spices because there's a wonderful passage right at the beginning of the book where Julia introduces it. She says, "The taste of politics is always bittersweet because the best and the worst of things are often inextricably woven together. I have endeavored to convey the complexity of the flavor, but for me, even in the most difficult of times, the sweet -- the ability to do things I so passionately believed would make our nation stronger and fairer -- was always the most intense."

Thank you so much.

MS. GILLARD: Thank you. (Applause)

* * * * *

CERTIFICATE OF NOTARY PUBLIC

I, Carleton J. Anderson, III do hereby certify that the forgoing electronic file when originally transmitted was reduced to text at my direction; that said transcript is a true record of the proceedings therein referenced; that I am neither counsel for, related to, nor employed by any of the parties to the action in which these proceedings were taken; and, furthermore, that I am neither a relative or employee of any attorney or counsel employed by the parties hereto, nor financially or otherwise interested in the outcome of this action.

Carleton J. Anderson, III

) Signature and Seal on File)

Notary Public in and for the Commonwealth of Virginia

Commission No. 351998

Expires: November 30, 2016